

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

**BENETH CASAS-AMADOR,  
#49869-177**

**Petitioner,**

**v.**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Respondent.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**CIVIL NO. 3:16-CV-2933-N-BK  
(Criminal No. 3:15-CR-336-N-1))**

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

The United States Magistrate Judge made Findings, Conclusions, and a Recommendation in this case. No objections were filed. The District Court reviewed the proposed Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation for plain error. Finding none, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the motion under [28 U.S.C. § 2255](#) to vacate, set aside, or correct sentence is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** to it being reasserted after the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit has determined Petitioner's direct criminal appeal.<sup>1</sup>

Considering the record in this case and pursuant to [Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22\(b\)](#), [Rule 11\(a\)](#) of the Rules Governing Sections 2254 and 2255 Proceedings in the United States District Court, and [28 U.S.C. § 2253\(c\)](#), the Court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability. The Court adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge's Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation filed in this case in support of its finding that the petitioner has failed to

---

<sup>1</sup> There is a one-year statute of limitations for filing motions to vacate, set aside, or correct sentence, which will apply to any subsequent section 2255 motion that Petitioner files in this Court. [28 U.S.C. § 2255\(f\)\(1\)-\(4\)](#).

show (1) that reasonable jurists would find this Court's "assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong," or (2) that reasonable jurists would find "it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right" and "debatable whether [this Court] was correct in its procedural ruling." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).<sup>1</sup>

If petitioner files a notice of appeal, petitioner must pay the \$505.00 appellate filing fee or submit a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

SO ORDERED this 16<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2016.

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Rule 11 of the Rules Governing §§ 2254 and 2255 Proceedings reads as follows:

**(a) Certificate of Appealability.** The district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant. Before entering the final order, the court may direct the parties to submit arguments on whether a certificate should issue. If the court issues a certificate, the court must state the specific issue or issues that satisfy the showing required by 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). If the court denies a certificate, the parties may not appeal the denial but may seek a certificate from the court of appeals under [Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22](#). A motion to reconsider a denial does not extend the time to appeal.

**(b) Time to Appeal.** [Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4\(a\)](#) governs the time to appeal an order entered under these rules. A timely notice of appeal must be filed even if the district court issues a certificate of appealability.